



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Indiana Primary Laws

By J. F. CONNELL, Wabash College

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer is deeply indebted to Mr. Charles Kettleboro, Director of the Indiana Legislative Reference Bureau, Mr. Frederic M. Guild, Instructor in Political Science at Indiana university, Albert J. Beveridge of Indianapolis, Governor Warren T. McCray of Indiana, Judge James E. Piety of Terre Haute, Mr. Martin M. Hugg of Indianapolis, the Legislative Reference Bureaus of Wisconsin, California and Iowa, James P. Goodrich of Winchester and Charles Evans Hughes for information and material contained in letters and published articles; to the county clerks of the counties mentioned in the tables used in this paper for the information supplied at my request, and to Dr. Lawrence Henry Gipson, of Wabash college, for his assistance and kindly criticism in the preparation of this paper.

There has been much adverse criticism directed toward the direct primary system in the past few years. Undoubtedly the primary has been used for a sufficiently long period of years in a large majority of the states¹ and under widely enough varied local political conditions to allow practical and theoretical students of politics to make an estimate of its actual worth. The direct primary was brought forward by progressives in politics and is supported by that class of political thinkers at the present time. Politicians of the old school especially were opposed to its adoption, have supported it only in a lukewarm manner, and now generally demand its repeal and a return to the old convention system.

It is necessary briefly to bring out the objections to most of the primary laws of the several states. The expense to the candidates and to the state is an important feature and it does not seem that any corrupt practice act yet enacted has been able to eliminate this most serious objection. Again, one of the most complicated problems with which students of the primary are confronted is the means by which members

¹According to a bulletin, issued in November, 1914, by the Indiana Legislative Reference Bureau, in 1914, forty states had some kind of a primary election law. Thirty states included mandatory and state-wide features. About sixty million people, or about 80 per cent of the population, choose their candidates for office through some sort of primary election.

of one party can be prevented from entering the primary of another party and naming the candidate—too often the weakest man. The nonpartisan primary was offered by former Governor Hiram Johnson of California as a remedy for that evil. Such a law was twice enacted by the legislature of that state and twice rejected by a referendum vote of the people, or, as the *Fresno Republican* says:

by such few of them as voted. On the face of it, it would seem that the people of California reject the theory but demand the practice of non-partisan primaries. However, the inconsistency may not be so great, since only a few of them voted at the referendum elections, while a much larger number voted at the actual primaries and insist on voting on a non-partisan basis.²

We find the same objections raised in Wisconsin in the governor's message of 1919.³ It says in part:

No party organization can be maintained under it (the Wisconsin law)—in fact it has again been demonstrated within this state in the past year that the adherents of one party may make an effort to nominate the candidate for another party in the hope of giving their party a better opportunity for success.

Governor Emanuel Phillip believes that the convention is the proper agency to name party candidates and platforms, and that the provisions of the Wisconsin law providing that the candidates shall frame the platform is wrong in principle and dangerous in practice.⁴

In recent governors' messages much attention is focused upon the direct primaries and the comment is usually unflattering. Governor Preus of Minnesota declares it "absurd and politically dishonest"; Governor Hart of Washington believes

that time and experience have demonstrated that the direct primary is not the rose-strewn pathway that leads to the political Utopia dreamed by its sponsors

² Editorial by Mr. Chester H. Rowell, former chairman Republican State Committee, September 4, 1918.

³ Message of Governor Emanuel L. Phillip to the Wisconsin Legislature, 1919, p. 21.

⁴ Message of Governor Emanuel L. Phillip to the Wisconsin Legislature, 1917, p. 22.

and charges "demoralization of responsible party organization, and unfair advantages to minority parties and groups"; Governor Robertson of Oklahoma declares

it defeats the very purpose of its original design by reason of the pernicious practices that have grown up and are seemingly incurable.⁵

Governor Warren T. McCray of Indiana in his message to the legislature of 1921 said of the primary:

The present law is cumbersome and entails a necessary expense which no man who seeks to serve his state or country in public office should be forced to bear. I believe that the direct primary should be retained for the selection of candidates for city, township and county officers and also for the selection of candidates for precinct committeemen and delegates to the state conventions.⁶

He also recommended that candidates for United States senator and governor, who are now chosen by the primary, providing that one candidate receives a majority of the votes cast, and for congressmen, state officials, and delegates to the national convention, be selected by a party nominating convention.⁷

It is significant to note that former State Senator Martin M. Hugg of Indianapolis, a co-author of the Indiana primary law of 1907, says:

I was a firm believer in primary reforms. It is ideal. But in practice, in my opinion, it is a failure. As election commissioner of this (Marion) county for three or four elections after the enactment of the law of 1907 I had the very best opportunity to see its operations. I then changed my opinion and now believe that the convention system with delegates elected under proper legal provisions is the better. The convention requires a majority to nominate. At a primary a plurality does the work. Geographical conditions are also to be considered. By this (the convention method) opportunity is given to nominate candidates representative of the different elements of the party. In the end tickets so nominated are better balanced than those selected at the primary.⁸

⁵ *The American Political Science Review*, May, 1921, p. 250.

⁶ Message of Governor Warren T. McCray to the Indiana Legislature, January 10, 1921.

⁷ Several weeks later both houses of the Indiana Legislature rejected a bill which incorporated these reforms by a very decisive vote, and it is believed that the people of Indiana support the action of their legislators rather than that of the governor and his associates.

⁸ Letter from Martin M. Hugg to the writer, May 24, 1921.

It is not to be believed that the rank and file of the voters of either of the major parties look with favor upon a return to the old convention system. In this connection it may be pointed out that the primary laws of Wisconsin have long been storm centers in legislative battles. The pro-primary view there is expressed by the *Capital Times*, which says:

With the return of the old guard leaders to power a comprehensive and nationwide attempt to smash the principle of the primary election is to be made this winter (1920-1921). Reactionary forces throughout the country have always hated the primary election law. They have magnified its imperfections as an excuse to return to something infinitely worse and more suited to the manipulation of the forces of reaction.⁹

The defenders of the primary system do not ordinarily claim that it is free from imperfections, but do maintain that the members of the party should have the privilege of nominating their party's candidates directly and without unreasonable dictation from party leaders who can not be held legally or morally responsible for that dictation. The views of the newer progressive elements in both political parties are probably well expressed by Mrs. Esther Griffin White, chairman of the Wayne County (Indiana) Women's Republican committee, who says:

Faulty as the primary law may be as at present constituted, it is a far step ahead of the convention system. Nothing less than banditry is played on the floor of conventions. The primary is a potent educational factor, for example, this community saw and heard every candidate for governor and president during the last campaign. If the primary was a big expense to the state it was money well spent. There is nothing the matter with the primary law; it is all right. The fault is in its administration.¹⁰

In former Senator Albert J. Beveridge of Indiana the primary has one of its most able defenders. In an address at South Bend, Indiana, Mr. Beveridge declared that the soundness of the principle of primary elections can not be denied and that it has met with the approval of the public. He charges that the movement to abolish it and to return to the

⁹ Editorial, Madison, Wisconsin *Capital Times*, November 16, 1920.

¹⁰ Mrs. Esther Griffith White of Richmond, Indiana, in the *Indianapolis Star*, January 28, 1921.

old convention system is the work of practical politicians of both parties seeking personal advantages.¹¹

It is significant to note that few writers defend the primary laws of their respective states in their entirety. Almost all admit imperfections and are seeking reforms for their correction. Roughly, we may divide students of the question into two classes, those who declare the principle of primary elections inherently wrong and who demand a return to the convention system of nomination, and those who maintain that the primary system is sound in principle and that our efforts should be directed toward eliminating the faults and weaknesses. We are not able to judge which view is preponderant, but the fact that there is general dissatisfaction with the present primary laws seems to indicate that some sort of reform is necessary and advisable.

The practice of nominating candidates of political parties by representative conventions has long been criticised. The first abandonment of the plan seems to have been in 1860 in Crawford county, Pennsylvania, where the local political leaders agreed to the selection of candidates by popular vote. The plan met with considerable favor and was tried locally in several states, particularly in Indiana.¹²

The first Indiana primary law was enacted by the legislature of 1901 and was designed for the use of local units only.¹³ It provided that counties containing cities of more than fifty thousand inhabitants might nominate county, township, and city officers by direct primary, providing that the party desiring to nominate its candidates in this way had cast ten per cent or more of the total vote at the preceding general election. The use of this method was thus made optional and the decision rested with the precinct committeemen. The management of the machinery of the primary was left with the party organization and the expense was borne by the party.¹⁴

¹¹ As reported by the *Indianapolis Star*, January 17, 1921.

¹² C. A. Beard, *American Government and Politics*, 692.

¹³ *Indiana Senate Journal*, 1901, Chapter 341. Senate Bill 91, March 11, 1901.

¹⁴ Party officers formed the board of primary election commissioners. It was also provided that two parties could not nominate their candidates at the same time and at the same place. Corrupt practice clauses, providing penalties for irregularities, were included, but as these penalties were usually lighter

The next law enacted in Indiana was in 1905 and was designed for Vigo county only.¹⁵ It made mandatory the selection of candidates for all county, township, and city offices and precinct committeemen, and delegates to state and congressional conventions in counties containing cities of over 36,500 inhabitants and less than 43,000 inhabitants by a primary election. The expenses of the primary were paid by the county and a fee was required to be paid by the candidate for nomination.¹⁶ In the main the general election laws were applied, especially with regard to irregular practices.¹⁷

The first general mandatory law was passed in 1907 and provided for the nomination of all county, township, and city officers, for precinct committeemen and delegates to the congressional and state conventions, by a primary election in counties containing cities of over 36,000 inhabitants. The law was optional with counties containing smaller cities. The provisions were in general the same as those enacted for Vigo county the previous session.¹⁸ This is the first primary law in Indiana which had a very general scope and was the result of a public demand for reform in the nomination of candidates.¹⁹

than those for similar abuses in general elections, and as the law specifically provided that lack of regular form of ballots, poll books, tally sheets, or other materials used was not sufficient cause for rejection of the vote, it is difficult to see how these clauses had a very far-reaching effect. The law also provided that counties containing cities of less than 50,000 inhabitants might use the direct primary system, provided the party organization so desired. In this case the secretary of state was to be notified.

¹⁵ *Indiana House Journal*, 1905, Chapter 73, House Bill 340, March 3, 1905.

¹⁶ A candidate was required to file notice of his candidacy not less than fifteen days nor more than twenty days before the date of the primary election. The fee was twenty-five dollars for candidates for offices paying more than five hundred dollars a year, and ten dollars for those paying less than that amount.

¹⁷ In a letter of April 26, 1921, to the writer, former Judge James E. Piety, of Terre Haute, Indiana, says: "The good people of Vigo county favored the passage of a primary law, thinking that it might bring about the nomination and election of better officers. We tried it and it did not prove a success. The general primary laws of the state have proved a failure in Vigo county. Our city and county officers are not as high class as they were before the primary laws were enacted."

¹⁸ The board of primary election commissioners was composed of the clerk of the circuit court, or of the city, according to whether it was a county or city election, and a representative appointed by him. The primary was held at the same place and time by each party participating. Candidates were not required to pay a fee under the provisions of this law.

¹⁹ The Governor's message of that year, *Indiana Senate Journal*, 1907, p. 91, recommends simpler and more comprehensive primary laws for the nomina-

In 1911 a general corrupt practices act was passed which applies to general and primary elections alike.²⁰ The penalties for tampering with the machinery of elections were made much more severe and the placing of primary elections on the same basis as general elections may be believed to have had a very satisfactory effect on public opinion regarding the importance of the primary.

No changes were then made in the primary laws until 1915, when three very important modifications were made.²¹ The law was made state-wide and mandatory for all parties casting over ten per cent of the total vote in the preceding general election. A preferential vote for president, United States senator, and governor was provided, and in case any candidate for any of these offices received a majority of the votes cast, the state convention was required to declare him the nominee of the party, or, as in the case of a candidate for president, that the delegates of the state vote for him as long as his name was before the convention.²² A first and second choice vote was also provided.²³ This law again provided for a small fee for candidates filing.²⁴

tion of all candidates for city, county, and township offices and delegates to conventions. A bill was introduced by Senator Charles O. Roemler, of Indianapolis, which was as sweeping in its scope as possible. All conventions, even state, were abolished, and the state officers were to be nominated by the primary method. The state central committee was to draft the party platform. On second reading Senator Martin M. Hugg, of Indianapolis, offered a substitute bill which was substantially the same as the bill finally enacted. The mandatory feature applied to only five counties, Marion, Vanderburg, Allen, St. Joseph and Vigo. After several hours debate a Republican caucus was held and Senator Hugg was appointed chairman of a committee to sponsor the bill, which was approved by the caucus. Letter from Senator Hugg, May 24, 1921.

²⁰ *Indiana Senate Journal*, 1911. Chapter 121. Senate Bill 43, March 3, 1911.

²¹ *Indiana House Journal*, 1915, Chapter 105, House Bill 74, March 9, 1915.

²² This was usually interpreted to mean as long as he had a reasonable chance for nomination.

²³ The following procedure was provided for the counting of first and second choice votes: A candidate was nominated if he received a majority of the first choice votes cast. If no candidate was thus nominated the one having the least number of first choice votes was dropped and the second choice votes of his supporters were added to the first choice votes of the candidate for whom cast. If no candidate then had a majority the process was repeated until a majority was obtained for some candidate.

²⁴ For offices paying less than a hundred dollars a year a fee of one dollar was required, and for those paying more than that amount 1 per cent. of the yearly salary was provided.

An amendment to this law was enacted in 1917 which abolished the second choice vote.²⁵ That feature of the 1915 law was not popular with the people or with the party leaders and its repeal was generally demanded. It is difficult to say what influence the second choice vote had in the one election in which it was used, but it is believed that this was not great.²⁶

Only one important change was made in the primary law by the 1921 session of the legislature. Independent candidates, so-called "soreheads," are prohibited from filing as candidates for election after a primary has been held. The courts have not yet handed down a decision on this law and it is not definitely known whether this excludes all independent candidates or only those who were candidates in the primary.

We have seen that the primary laws in Indiana have been far from static and a study of their operation is made particularly hard for this reason. However, the law has not been changed materially in the past five years and we are able to discover some very striking facts. Mr. Charles Kettleboro, director of the Indiana legislative reference bureau, has made a very interesting study of the operation of the 1916, 1918, and 1920 primaries.²⁷ For these three years there were 1,049 offices to be filled, and candidates for 623, or 59%, had no opposition. In the Democratic party in 1916, 40% were unopposed, in 1918 60%, and in 1920 65%. In the Republican party in 1916, 46% were unopposed, in 1918 62%, and in 1920 56%. As Mr. Kettleboro points out, we may safely accept as the basis of our study that where a candidate has no opposition he is either brought out by the machine or is favored by it. If this were not the case the party leaders would bring some one out in opposition to him. Thus we see from the above figures that the majority of the ticket in most cases is probably not named by the people in the operation of the primary, but by the party leaders. I do not mean to say that this opportunity is abused by them, or that incompetent or vicious candidates are always thrust upon the people by these

²⁵ *Indiana Senate Journal*, 1917, Chapter 117, Senate Bill 433, March 8, 1917.

²⁶ Mr. Charles Kettleboro, director of the Indiana legislative reference bureau, believes that the second choice vote was not given a fair trial, and that its repeal at that time was unfortunate.

²⁷ *National Municipal Review*, March, 1921, p. 166.

leaders, but we must recognize that in very many cases the people do not name the ticket.²⁸

In this state the precinct committeemen are the basis of the organization of political parties. They elect the county chairmen, who in turn elect the district chairmen. The thirteen district chairmen compose the state central committee and elect the state chairman. It is obvious that a control of the precinct committeemen will eventually lead to a control of the entire political machinery of the state. We have the following figures for Marion county which show the lack of opposition for these important party offices:²⁹

Year	Precincts	Republican			Democratic		
		No. candi- dates	1	2 or more	No candi- dates	1	2 or more
1916	158	---	83	75	---	131	27
1918	163	4	104	55	15	141	7
1920	177	22	82	95	---	94	83

The writer had hoped to be able to present figures from all of the counties in the state and discover how far this same condition prevailed in local politics. Due to errors in the records, incomplete records, and the failure to get information from the clerks of the circuit courts, only the following incomplete table could be compiled, yet we can discover from it the same general tendencies in most of the counties.³⁰

²⁸ This fact is also borne out by a little incident that was called to my attention. The authenticity of it cannot be vouched for, yet I will present it for what it is worth, as it comes from a reliable source. Thirty minutes before the balloting began in the Republican state convention, in May, 1920, a newspaper reporter walked thru the assembled delegates in Tomlinson Hall, Indianapolis and asked many of them who was going to be nominated for a certain state office. Invariably the reply was: "I don't know; the 'dope' hasn't come down yet." We may well believe from this that to some degree at least the people did not nominate the state ticket, thru their properly elected delegates, but that the work was really done by some one higher up, who handed down the "dope."

²⁹ Mr. Kettleboro, in the *National Municipal Review*, March, 1921.

³⁰ There are undoubtedly errors in this table, as all of the information with the exception of Fountain, Monroe and Montgomery counties was obtained by letter from the clerks of the circuit courts. The information from Monroe county was obtained from Dr. Frederic H. Guild, Instructor in Political Science in Indiana university, and that for Fountain and Montgomery counties was obtained by the writer personally. It must be remembered that we know nothing of the local political conditions, which always affect the contests for nomination. The insufficiency of these figures is realized, and yet it is hoped that they may indicate the general tendency.

Table showing the number of contests for county, and other local offices, precinct committeemen, and delegates to the state convention for 1916, 1918 and 1920:

County ³¹	Year	Number of candidates								Per cent uncon- tested
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Benton -----	1916----	1	12	6	2	1	0	0	0	57
	1918----	3	21	8	1	0	1	0	0	67
	1920----	0	5	4	0	0	1	1	0	45
Fountain -----	1916----	0	55	3	0	0	0	0	0	94
	1918----	2	63	11	1	1	0	0	0	80
	1920----	0	65	4	2	1	0	0	0	90
Franklin -----	1916----	0	1	9	7	3	0	0	0	5
	1918----	0	1	5	2	2	0	0	0	10
	1920----	0	0	5	2	0	1	2	1	0
Hamilton -----	1916 ³² ---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	1918----	0	8	1	2	2	1	0	1	53
	1920----	0	13	5	1	0	1	0	0	65
Huntington -----	1916 ³² ---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	1918----	0	38	1	3	0	0	0	0	90
	1920----	0	29	7	2	0	0	0	0	76
Jefferson -----	1916----	1	98	3	2	0	0	0	0	94
	1918----	19	163	4	1	2	0	0	0	96
	1920----	4	102	1	1	0	0	0	0	98
Monroe -----	1916 ³² ---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	1918 ³² ---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	1920----	0	65	13	6	2	0	1	0	74
Montgomery -----	1916----	0	59	2	2	0	0	1	0	92
	1918----	0	57	0	1	1	0	0	0	96
	1920----	0	56	14	3	0	0	0	0	76
Newton -----	1916----	0	1	3	2	3	1	1	0	9
	1918----	0	6	5	3	2	0	1	0	35
	1920----	0	5	2	1	2	0	1	0	45

County ³¹	Year	Number of candidates								Per cent uncon- tested
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Orange	1916 ³²	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	1918	0	26	32	12	3	2	0	1	33
	1920	0	0	35	1	1	0	0	0	0
Owen	1916	0	0	1	2	2	1	2	1	0
	1918	0	0	3	4	0	2	0	1	0
	1920	0	0	3	0	4	3	0	0	0
Parke	1916	0	16	7	1	1	0	0	0	64
	1918	0	19	6	0	0	0	0	0	76
	1920	0	13	5	1	1	0	0	0	65
Porter	1916 ³²	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	1918 ³²	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	1920	0	27	1	6	1	1	0	0	63
Pulaski	1916	0	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	56
	1918	0	17	3	0	0	0	0	0	85
	1920	0	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	89
Scott	1916	0	1	2	3	3	2	0	0	9
	1918	0	1	5	4	1	0	2	0	7
	1920	0	0	2	1	4	2	0	0	0
Starke	1916	0	11	2	5	2	2	0	0	44
	1918	0	9	20	9	8	4	6	0	16
	1920	0	1	2	1	6	1	1	0	17
Union	1916 ³²	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	1918 ³²	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	1920	0	25	4	1	0	0	0	0	83
Washington	1916	3	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
	1918	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1920	0	0	6	1	1	0	0	0	0
White	1916	0	12	5	0	1	0	0	0	66
	1918	0	30	1	3	1	2	0	0	81
	1920	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Total per cent uncontested										70.9

³¹ The following information was received from three counties:

County	Number of Candidates	Number of Offices
Jennings	109	35
Kosciusko	311	58
Martin	408	200

³² No record for these years.

As was seen, the per cent of local offices uncontested was 70.9, and that of state offices 59. In nine of these local primaries 90% of the candidates were unopposed, in seventeen 75% were unopposed, in twenty-seven over 50% were unopposed, and in only nine were there contests for all offices. These figures seem to indicate that there is the same tendency in local offices as in the state offices. In many instances, as was suggested, the leaders of the party name the ticket.³³ Thus we have practically the Hughes plan in operation in Indiana without proper legal machinery for its use.³⁴

The following table shows the per cent of unopposed candidates in these counties and the expense of the primary there.

County ³⁵	Per cent candidates unopposed		Expense
	1916	1918	
Benton -----	1916 57	1918 67	\$1828.35
			1410.00
Fountain -----	1916 94	1918 80	1889.32
			1784.00
Franklin -----	1916 5	1918 10	2130.58
			1542.00
Hamilton -----	1916 ³⁶ --	1918 53	3286.00

Huntington -----	1916 ³⁶ --	1918 90	2411.00

Jefferson -----	1916 94	1918 96	2282.75
			2514.00
Montgomery -----	1916 --	1918 --	2937.00
			2824.00
Newton -----	1916 9	1918 35	1048.41
			1093.00
Orange -----	1916 ³⁶ --	1918 33	2457.00

Owen -----	1916 0	1918 0	1787.59
			1888.00

	1916	64	3080.48
Parke -----	1918	76	3455.00
	1916	56	1309.23
Pulaski -----	1918	85	948.00
	1916	9	1134.76
Scott -----	1918	7	952.00
	1916	44	1939.73
Starke -----	1918	16	1617.00
	1916	0	2261.60
Washington -----	1918	0	2473.00
	1916	66	3436.13
White -----	1918	81	3331.00

It is unfortunate that the Indiana law provides that the primary election records for local offices need only be kept for six months. Not only is this likely to lead to irregularities, but it is almost impossible as a result to collect such information for Indiana as we have from Iowa. There should be a change in our law requiring that these records be kept permanently.

Thus we find that we are spending a total of \$606,490.93 in these counties for which the records are complete for the years 1916 and 1918 for the nomination of candidates of whom about seventy per cent for local offices are unopposed, and fifty-six per cent for state offices. Of course, there is the provision in the state laws that where there is no opposition there is no primary held, but there is usually some opposition and the total expense of the primary must be borne for the nomination of these few candidates where there is opposition. In the majority of these instances it appears to be not a ques-

³³ The clerk of the Fountain Circuit Court said that the last day for filing for one primary there were no Democratic candidates filed. A group of party leaders assembled in a law office across the street from the court house and made a ticket and filed it. This was done thru no desire to dictate the ticket, but from a desire to see that the party had a ticket in the field.

³⁴ We are not able to say how far this situation holds true in other states, but we present the following table by Mr. Frank Edward Horack, as printed in the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, of January, 1921, which shows the same general tendencies in Iowa:

tion of the fitness of the candidates for the office and the public would be served equally well by either candidate. Indeed, many times it is a struggle between two local leaders for control of the party organization and the candidacy for these local offices is merely expresesive of that struggle. Yet we spend thousands of dollars in these contests and for ratifying the choice of unopposed candidates. We may well ask ourselves how important these elections are to good government in the community and to the proper conduct of public business.

Another serious defect in our primary law referred to at the beginning of this article is the inability of one party to keep the members of another party from coming into the primary and helping to nominate its candidates.³⁵ One of the most flagrant examples of this was in the recent city primary of Indianapolis, where Samuel Lewis Shank was nominated as the Republican candidate for mayor. Political experts of the city estimate that fully twenty thousand Democrats voted in the Republican primary and that almost all of these votes went to Mr. Shank, as it was rather generally admitted that he would be the weakest candidate and the least desirable to the Republican organization.³⁶ No satisfactory plan has as yet been devised in Indiana whereby we may insure that such abuses of primary legislation will not occur.

In considering this question of primary reform we have one very decided handicap always with us which we must recognize. Former Governor James P. Goodrich of Indiana stated it as follows :

It is very difficult to frame any sort of legislation that can control the election that will be automatic in its application and will make up for the appalling neglect of the average citizen to give any time to politics.³⁷

The percentage of qualified voters who cast their ballots in the 1916, 1918 and 1920 primaries well illustrates this lack of interest. In the Democratic party in 1916, 50% voted, in 1918 47%, and in 1920 32%. In the Republican party in 1916 62% voted, in 1918 46%, and in 1920 67%.

³⁵ No expense records are available as yet for 1920.

³⁶ No records.

State Offices, 1908-1920.							
Number of candidates -----	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Number of offices -----	59	23	10	7	1	1	1
	Congressional Offices, 1908-1920.						
Number of candidates -----	0	1	2	3	4	--	--
Number of offices -----	10	87	45	8	2	--	--
	County Offices, 1908-1920.						
Number of candidates -----	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of offices -----	335	552	113	48	4	4	2
							Per cent unopposed
							53
							69
							74

²⁵ In *Mote vs. Cassidy*, the supreme court of Indiana, on January 5, 1916, ruled that "the primary election laws are not designed for nonpartisan nominations. Their sole object is to regulate nominations by political parties. No well disposed person would seek to intrude into an organization whose principles he disapproves."

²⁶ In the seventh ward Shank received 372 more votes than did Mr. Harding in the last presidential election. There were also two other candidates for mayor, and the presidential election of last fall was a Republican landslide, so these figures are very significant. The figures from several of the other wards are also indicative of the fact that Democrats must have voted in this Republican primary.

²⁷ Letter of June 3, 1921, to the writer.